

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending; all claims have been rejected. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,774,866 (Horwitz) and Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,617,526 (Oran) and Horwitz. Claims 1-5 are independent claims.

Horwitz describes a computer system that checks for conflicts in proposed new matters in an organization with numerous clients. The system compares data concerning potential relationships with data denoting existing relationships to identify potential conflicts where the client in a potential matter is the same as the client in an existing matter.

The Examiner repeated the same arguments from the previous Office Action in support of the rejections and did not find Applicant's prior arguments persuasive. However, the Examiner noted that features relied on to show a patentable distinction – “the registering element claimed in the present application produces dynamic results” – were not in the claims. The claims have been amended to include the dynamic and simultaneous registration of functions corresponding to a change in status.

The present invention provides for a plurality of functions registered to a single indicator. An RSSI (Received Signal Strength Indicator), alarm setting, arrival of an SMS (Short Message Service) message, battery strength, and call reservation setting, are just an example of the functions that can be registered to a single indicator. When a certain event – such as receiving an SMS or battery level dropping below a predetermined threshold – occurs, the indicator is displayed and the corresponding, registered function is invoked. So when an SMS is received, the status indicator is displayed and the registered function for reading the SMS is provided. Tables 1 and 2 in the specification show functions being assigned to state indicators.

In particular, amended Claims 1-3 all recite “registering one of the related functions for the state indicator *corresponding to a current status change* when the state change to be reflected in the representation of the state indicator occurs.” The registering step of Claims 1-3, therefore, produces dynamic results; the function registered for the state indicator depends upon, or *corresponds to*, a current status change. Therefore, the registered function changes with the current status, making

registration dynamic. The registration is simultaneous because it occurs “*when* the state change ... occurs.”

Amended Claim 5 also recites the dynamic and simultaneous registration of functions corresponding to a change in status. Specifically, Claim 5 now recites “registering an *alarm function* ...for the *alarm state indicator* when the alarm is set.” The alarm function is registered dynamically for the alarm state indicator, simultaneously with the occurrence of the event, i.e., when the alarm is set.

As stated in the previous Reply, Horwitz describes static assignments, e.g., by clicking on the alarm the evaluator always produces the same result, the same command is executed on a list of potential matters supplied. To the contrary, the registering element claimed in the present application produces dynamic results. Amended Claims 1-3 and 5 recites these dynamic results.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 4, Oran provides a system visual notification area for displaying visual notifications, which provide to a user visual cues of the nature of the intended notification. The visual notifications may notify a user of events, status information, or other information.

Claim 4 has also been amended to recite the dynamic results of the present invention. More specifically, amended Claim 4 reads “registering a message reading function *of the related functions* for the message state indicator *when* the message arrives.” The message reading function is selected from a plurality of functions (“the related functions”) and registered to the message state indicator dynamically and simultaneously with the message arrival.

Oran does not teach or suggest *dynamically* assigning a function to an icon *at the time of* occurrence of an event or “registering a message reading function *of the related functions* for the message state indicator *when* the message arrives”, as recited in Claim 4.

Accordingly, Claims 1-5 are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. It is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1-5, and further, respectfully submitted that Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-8484
(516) 228-8516 (Facsimile)